


PRE-APPEAL BRIEF REQUEST FOR REVIEW		Docket Number Q88256
Mail Stop AF Commissioner for Patents P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, VA 22313-1450	Application Number 10/539,010	Filed June 15, 2005
	First Named Inventor Hiroaki YAMADA	
	Art Unit 2839	Examiner Vladimir IMAS
<p style="text-align: center;">WASHINGTON DC SUGHRUE/265550 65565 CUSTOMER NUMBER</p>		
<p>Applicant requests review of the final rejection in the above-identified application. No amendments are being filed with this request.</p> <p>This request is being filed with a notice of appeal</p> <p>The review is requested for the reasons(s) stated on the attached sheet(s).</p> <p>Note: No more than five (5) pages may be provided.</p>		
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> I am an attorney or agent of record. Registration number <u>59,561</u>		 Signature
<u>Dion R. Ferguson</u> Typed or printed name		
<u>(202) 293-7060</u> Telephone number		
<u>June 28, 2007</u> Date		

PATENT APPLICATION

IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

In re application of

Docket No: Q88256

Hiroaki YAMADA, et al.

Appln. No.: 10/539,010

Group Art Unit: 2839

Confirmation No.: 7398

Examiner: Vladimir IMAS

Filed: June 15, 2005

For: CASSETTE RELAY BLOCK ATTACHEMENT STRUCTURE

PRE-APPEAL BRIEF REQUEST FOR REVIEW

MAIL STOP AF - PATENTS

Commissioner for Patents

P.O. Box 1450

Alexandria, VA 22313-1450

Sir:

Pursuant to the Pre-Appeal Brief Conference Pilot Program, and further to the Examiner's Final Office Action dated March 2, 2007, Applicant files this Pre-Appeal Brief Request for Review. This Request is also accompanied by the filing of a Notice of Appeal.

Applicant turns now to the rejections at issue. As of the Advisory Action mailed June 7, 2007, the Amendment filed May 31, 2007, has been entered, and claims 1-22 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by Akiyama, et al. (U.S. 6,022,247).

In the Final Office action dated March 2, 2007, the Examiner alleges that claims 1-22 read on Akiyama. Specifically, the Examiner alleges that FIG. 1-5 describes all of the elements of claims 1-22. With regard to claim 1, the Examiner alleges that element 4 corresponds to the

PRE-APPEAL BRIEF REQUEST FOR REVIEW
U.S. Application No. 10/539,010

Docket No. Q88256

cassette relay block, element 6 corresponds to the lock portion, element 2a corresponds to the peripheral walls on the attaching member, and element 7a corresponds to the locked portion.²

Applicants respectfully submit Akiyama fails to disclose all of the features recited in claim 1 because Akiyama fails to disclose that the lock portion is disposed inwardly of an outermost wall surface of the cassette relay block.

Akiyama discloses an electric wiring block 1 in which a main block body 2 holds a plurality of cassette blocks 3 and 4.³ The cassette blocks 3 and 4 have lock claws 6 and 11 disposed as projections out side the outermost wall surface of the main body of the cassette blocks 3 and 4.⁴ Thus, the lock claws 6 and 11 are not disposed inwardly of an outermost wall surface of the cassette relay block, as recited in claim 1.

Additionally, Applicants submit that claims 2 and 3 are patentable over the applied art. Claim 2 recites “said lock portion and locked portion are housed in the projected area of a relay attached to said cassette relay block.” The Examiner alleges that Akiyama discloses this aspect of the instant invention, but fails to cite where Akiyama teaches or suggests that the lock and locked portions are housed in the projected area of a relay attached to said cassette relay block.⁵ Rather, Akiyama, indicates that a lock claw and securing rib are located within the electric

² See Final Office Action dated March 2, 2007, page 2.

³ See *Akiyama*, FIG. 1.

⁴ *Id.*

⁵ See Final Office Action dated March 2, 2007, page 2.

PRE-APPEAL BRIEF REQUEST FOR REVIEW
U.S. Application No. 10/539,010

Docket No. Q88256

wiring block body, but no indication is made that an attached relay is projected where the lock claw and securing rib are located.⁶

Claim 3 recites “said lock portion is arranged in a range surrounded by crossing outer wall surfaces of the terminal housing parts.” As noted above, the lock claws on the cassette block are projected from the center of the outside walls of the cassette block.⁷ Thus, the lock claws cannot be arranged in a range by crossing outer wall surfaces, as recited in claim 3.

In the Advisory Action, the Examiner again argues that Akiyama in fig. 5, discloses lock portion 6 disposed inwardly of an outermost wall surface 6a.⁸

Applicants again disagree. Akiyama indicate that the lock claws 6 are “at given positions *on the respective outside portions* of the cassette blocks 3 and 4, lock claws 6 are provided as shown in FIG. 5.”⁹ Thus, the lock portion cannot be considered to be *inwardly of an outermost wall surface* of the cassette relay block, as alleged by the Examiner and recited in claim 1.

Further, the Examiner has not responded to the arguments presented with regard to claims 2 and 3, as required by MPEP 707.07(f). MPEP §707.07(f) states that “[w]here the applicant traverses any rejection, the examiner should, if he or she repeats the rejection, take note of the

⁶ See Akiyama, FIGS. 1 and 6.

⁷ See Akiyama, FIG. 1.

⁸ See Advisory Action dated June 7, 2007, page 2.

⁹ See Akiyama, Col. 5, lines 9-12.

PRE-APPEAL BRIEF REQUEST FOR REVIEW
U.S. Application No. 10/539,010

Docket No. Q88256

Applicant's argument and answer the substance of it." Thus Applicants' argument with respect to claims 2 and 3 have not been properly rebutted.

Conclusion

For the reasons noted above, Appellants respectfully submit that claims 1-22 are patentable over the applied art.

Respectfully submitted,



Dion R. Ferguson
Registration No. 59,561

SUGHRUE MION, PLLC
Telephone: (202) 293-7060
Facsimile: (202) 293-7860

WASHINGTON DC SUGHRUE/265550

65565

CUSTOMER NUMBER

Date: June 28, 2007